



Homeland Security

Science and Technology

U.S. Department of Homeland Security



System Assessment and Validation for Emergency Responders

The U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) established the System Assessment and Validation for Emergency Responders (SAVER) Program to assist emergency responders making procurement decisions.

Located within the Science and Technology Directorate (S&T) of DHS, the SAVER Program conducts objective assessments and validations on commercial equipment and systems, and provides those results along with other relevant equipment information to the emergency response community in an operationally useful form. SAVER provides information on equipment that falls within the categories listed in the DHS Authorized Equipment List (AEL).

The SAVER Program is supported by a network of technical agents who perform assessment and validation activities. Further, SAVER focuses primarily on two main questions for the emergency responder community: "What equipment is available?" and "How does it perform?"

For more information on this and other technologies, contact the SAVER Program Support Office.

RKB/SAVER Telephone: 877-336-2752

E-mail: saver@dhs.gov

Website: <https://www.rkb.us/saver>

Reference herein to any specific commercial products, processes, or services by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the U.S. Government. Neither the U.S. Government nor any of its employees make any warranty, expressed or implied, including but not limited to the warranties of merchantability and fitness for a particular purpose for any specific commercial product, process, or service referenced herein.

Summary

Remotely Operated Underwater Vehicle Systems

(AEL reference number 03OE-07-RPVS)

Remotely operated underwater vehicle (ROV) systems equipped with underwater imaging technology can be used in conjunction with or in place of a dive team. In many cases, a system can perform an operation more quickly than a dive team. These systems—consisting of a submersible ROV, umbilical, and control console—can support both sonar and video technologies for side-by-side visual and acoustic display. Applications for ROV systems may include:

- Inspecting ship hulls, pier pilings, and bridges;
- Directing divers to an area of interest;
- Recovering evidence that was discarded in a body of water; and
- Inspecting an object or area of interest before deploying divers.

In order to provide emergency responders with information on currently available ROV systems, the Space and Naval Warfare Systems Center (SPAWAR SYSCEN) Atlantic conducted a comparative assessment of ROV systems for the System Assessment and Validation for Emergency Responders (SAVER) Program in August 2010. Detailed findings are provided in revision A of the *Remotely Operated Underwater Vehicle Systems Assessment Report*, which is available to registered responders by request at <https://www.rkb.us/saver>.

Background

This summary is for revision A of the *Remotely Operated Underwater Vehicle Systems Assessment Report*, (February 2012). The original January 2011 report has been revised due to inconsistencies found after publication of the report. Due to these inconsistencies, the assessment results for the affordability category are not included in the assessment report or this summary. In addition, errors regarding the actual model numbers and options assessed were corrected; descriptions of the systems, as assessed, can be found in the assessment report. Vendors should be contacted for current information on models, accessories, options, prices, warranties, and support.

Assessment Methodology

Prior to the assessment, eight emergency responders were chosen from various jurisdictions to participate in a focus group. Participants possessed strong backgrounds in marine patrol or underwater search and rescue. The group recommended product selection criteria, vendors, and possible scenarios for the assessment; however, their primary objective was to identify evaluation criteria.

After identifying evaluation criteria, the focus group assigned each criterion to one of the five SAVER categories, and then assigned a weight for its level of importance. Once the criteria were weighted, the five SAVER categories were assigned a percentage value to represent the level of each category's importance relative to the other categories.

Based on focus group recommendations, market research, and equipment availability, the following systems were selected for assessment:

- LBV300-5, SeaBotix Inc.;
- Pro 4PS 300SE, VideoRay® LLC;
- Seamor 300F, Seamor Marine Ltd.; and
- Outland 1000, Outland Technology Inc.

Five emergency responders served as evaluators for this assessment. All evaluators had at least 16 years of experience in law enforcement, fire service, emergency services, or underwater search and rescue operations.

During the assessment, evaluators rated the ROV systems based on the evaluation criteria established by the focus group. The assessment was separated into two phases: the specification assessment and the operational assessment. Evaluators assessed the systems based on vendor-provided information during the specification assessment. Hands-on experience setting up and configuring the systems for use, operating the systems in controlled and uncontrolled environments, restoring the systems to pre-deployment condition, and repackaging the systems for storage served as the basis for the operational assessment.

Assessment Results

All four ROV systems scored favorably overall. Table 1 displays the composite assessment scores as well as the category scores for each system. Higher scores indicate a higher rating by evaluators. The advantages and disadvantages of each system, as identified by evaluators, are listed in table 2. To view how each ROV system scored against the evaluation criteria assigned to the SAVER categories, see table 3.

Throughout the assessment, the evaluators stated that, most importantly, an ROV system should be easy to put into service, be easy to maneuver, and have a user interface that is easy to use. Evaluators also made the following common observations regarding the assessed ROV systems:

- The depth ratings of the four ROV systems were considered more than adequate for most applications.
- Maintenance training would be required in order to perform field upgrades to the assessed ROV systems. All four vendors offer maintenance training at an additional cost; evaluators felt this training should be included in the initial cost of an ROV system.
- All four vendors offer customer-site training; evaluators considered this beneficial and important to agencies with large dive teams.

Emergency responder agencies that may be considering the purchase of an ROV system should review the detailed findings provided in revision A of the *Remotely Operated Underwater Vehicle Systems Assessment Report* and carefully consider each system's overall capabilities and limitations in relation to their jurisdiction's operational needs.

All reports in this series, as well as reports on other technologies, are available to registered responders in the SAVER section of the Responder Knowledge Base (RKB) website at <https://www.rkb.us/saver>.

SAVER Category Definitions

Affordability groups criteria related to life-cycle costs of a piece of equipment or system.

Capability groups criteria related to the power, capacity, or features available for a piece of equipment or system to perform or assist the responder in performing one or more relevant tasks.

Deployability groups criteria related to the movement, installation, or implementation of a piece of equipment or system by responders at the site of its intended use.

Maintainability groups criteria related to the maintenance and restoration of a piece of equipment or system to operational condition by responders.

Usability groups criteria related to the quality of the responders' experience with the operational employment of a piece of equipment or system. This includes the relative ease of use, efficiency, and overall satisfaction of the responders with the equipment or system.

Table 1. ROV System Assessment Results

System	Composite Score	Capability (32.5% Weighting)	Deployability (15% Weighting)	Maintainability (12.5% Weighting)	Usability (40% Weighting)
LBV300-5	3.9	4.0	3.7	3.7	3.9
Pro 4PS 300SE	3.4	3.3	4.0	3.0	3.3
Seamor 300F	3.3	3.5	2.9	3.0	3.4
Outland 1000	3.1	3.4	3.1	3.1	3.0

Table 2. ROV System Advantages and Disadvantages


System	Advantages	Disadvantages
 LBV300-5 Composite Score: 3.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Easy to maneuver the submersible ROV Auto heading worked well System size and weight Control console layout and weather resistance Display readable in direct sunlight 24/7 technical support at no cost Comprehensive technical manuals and maintenance kit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changing/replacing the center thruster is labor intensive Thruster power low for use in strong currents No still image capture
 Pro 4PS 300SE Composite Score: 3.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> System size and weight Easy to maneuver the submersible ROV Operating temperature range Easy to record and capture still images Reserve power capacity Image quality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Umbilical connector strength Technical support Field maintenance requires training Graphical user interface (GUI) uses overlapping windows Auto heading did not perform well No lateral thrusters Manipulator arm/grabber
 Seamor 300F Composite Score: 3.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Layout of controls Easy to maneuver the submersible ROV Automatic and manual zoom and focus Thruster power Manipulator arm/grabber rotates Optional altimeter 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bend radius and tensile strength of the umbilical Difficult to connect the umbilical to the submersible ROV Durability of Teflon® studs and float Weather resistance No split-screen capability Manipulator arm/grabber mounting interferes with camera rotation
 Outland 1000 Composite Score: 3.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Durable, open frame with easy access for performing maintenance Interchangeable thrusters with magnetically coupled propellers Comprehensive digital video recorder (DVR) with character generator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Control console weather resistance System size, weight, and portability Display visibility No still image capture Manipulator arm/grabber mounting position interferes with camera

Table 3. ROV System Criteria Ratings¹

KEY		LBY300-5	Pro 4PS 300SE	Seamer 300F	Outland 1000
Least Favorable	Most Favorable				
					
Thrusters		 	 	 	 
Basic instrumentation		 	 	 	 
Depth rating		 	 	 	 
Umbilical characteristics		 	 	 	 
Camera		 	 	 	 
Video output		 	 	 	 
Expandability		 	 	 	 
Advanced instrumentation		 	 		 
Deployability					
Power		 	 	 	 
Portability		 	 	 	 
Submersible ROV launch and recovery		 	 	 	 
Size		 	 	 	 
Weather resistant		 	 	 	 
Easy to assemble		 	 	 	 
Pre-dive procedure		 	 	 	 
Operating temperature		 	 	 	 
Maintainability					
Technical support		 	 	 	 
Technical manual		 	 	 	 
Field upgradable		 	 	 	 
Maintenance kit		 	 		 
Time to change/replace		 	 	 	 
Storage temperature		 	 	 	 
Decontamination		 	 	 	 
Usability					
Maneuverability		 	 	 	 
Training		 	 	 	 
Intuitive controls		 	 	 	 
User guide		 	 	 	 
Portable topside control		 	 	 	 
Auto altimeter		 	 	 	 
Auto depth		 	 	 	 
Auto heading		 	 		 
Display		 	 	 	 
Video recording		 	 	 	 
Video overlay		 	 		 
Video/photo settings		 	 	 	 
Positioning technology		 	 	 	 
Intuitive software		 	 	 	 
Reel type		 	 	 	 

Note:

¹ Averaged criteria ratings for each assessed product are graphically represented by colored and shaded circles. Highest ratings are represented by full green circles.